



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

**Solicitation Information
May 5, 2014**

ADDENDUM # 3

RFP # 7548633

**TITLE: Technical Services to Evaluate the Implications of Climate Change
With Respect to Rhode Island Wastewater Collection and Treatment
Infrastructure**

**SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN POSTPONED UNTIL:
Friday May 16, 2014 at 11:30 am (Local Time)**

**Attached are the questions received with responses no further questions will be
answered**

**Thomas Bovis
Interdepartmental Project Manager**

*Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be
posted.*

**TITLE: Technical Services to Evaluate the Implications of Climate Change
With Respect to Rhode Island Wastewater Collection and Treatment
Infrastructure**

Questions:

1. In Section 1 – Introduction , pg. 2, 3rd paragraph, the RFP notes:

“Respondents to this solicitation are hereby advised that the respondent selected for aware or a contract pursuant to this solicitation, and its affiliated or subsidiary companies (whether partially or wholly owned), shall be ineligible to bid upon any future consulting or construction solicitations which may arise from or relate to the services described in this solicitation. In addition, any sub-consultant or subcontractors engaged by the respondent selected for award of a contract who performs any services arising from this solicitation shall be ineligible to bid upon any future consulting or construction solicitation activities which may arise from or relate to the services described in this solicitation.”

It is appreciated if the Department could help clarify and/ or provide further comment on this statement.

IMPORTANT. PLEASE TAKE NOTE.

Response: This paragraph is standard language that the State applies to *state* consulting projects that result in engineering designs which lead to subsequent *state* construction projects. The State has an interest in ensuring the independence of the entities involved in design work; e.g. preparation of engineering plans and those involved in the related implementation of those designs; e.g. construction contractors. This Request for Proposals constitutes a statewide assessment for planning purposes that will result in recommendations for a range of structural and non-structural actions related to wastewater infrastructure that is largely not owned or operated by the State. This project is not intended to result in site specific engineering designs. Therefore, the State interpretation of this paragraph is that it will **not** prevent the selected respondent from bidding on future opportunities to conduct consulting or engineering work related to the feasibility, design or implementation of any action recommended in the report generated via this RFP.

2. The RFP indicates that “Respondents should be aware of all applicable MBE requirements, as set forth in RI Gen. Law 37-14.1-1, *et seq.* The State’s goal is for a minimum of ten percent (10%) participation by MBE’s in all State procurements.”

If a firm is capable of providing all the advertised specialty engineering services (professional services) “in-house”, is it a requirement of this RFP to retain additional “out-of-house” services to provide a minimum 10% MBE participation on this assignment?

Response: The awarded supplier will need to request this from the MBE office.

3. If a respondent chooses to write a Cover Letter with their proposal, should the Cover Letter considered in the Technical Proposal’s 25 pages?

Response: No. The cover letter will not be counted as part of the Technical Proposal.

4. Task 7 (RIDEM Optional Task) Environmental Assessment. Recognizing that this work task is identified as an “Optional Task”, is this work effort and its associated fee/ cost included in the evaluation of the respondents overall cost proposals?

Response: The cost of Task 7 should be included in the cost proposal. Respondents should reflect costs for Tasks 1-6, include a subtotal for Tasks 1-6, reflect the cost for Task 7 and then provide a total cost for all tasks. If RIDEM elects to contract for Task 7, then the projected costs will be included and considered in the cost evaluation. In the event the RIDEM elects not to contract for Task 7, then the cost evaluation will be based on the total costs for Tasks 1-6.

5. Page 7, Task 6. “Based on the project results, the vendor will develop and provide appropriate outreach materials, such as a simplified summary fact sheets, that are customized for each community...”. Could RIDEM please specify the number of communities that are expected to receive factsheets?

Response: All communities for which a vulnerability assessment is performed will receive a fact sheet or other outreach material(s). This material will be of varying complexity based on the assessment findings.

6. Page 8, Task 7. Could RIDEM please clarify whether Task 7 should be included in the cost proposal, and as a portion of the total available funding?

Response: See 4 above. Task 7 costs should be included. RIDEM anticipates accessing an additional source of funding for completion of Task 7.

7. Page 8, Task 7. Could RIDEM please clarify whether Task 7 should be considered part of the 12 month project time-frame (as noted on page 9)?

Response: The twelve month timeframe applies to Tasks 1-6. Task 7 would be expected to go past the 12-month project timeframe.

8. Page 9, Proposal Contents. Would RIDEM prefer to see full resumes of key staff included as an appendix?

Response: DEM has no preference in this regard but resumes can be included within an appendix.

9. Page 9, Proposal Contents. Could RIDEM please clarify whether resumes count towards the 25 page limit of the technical proposal?

Response: The qualifications of staff should be described generally in body of the technical proposal. However, resumes can be attached as an appendix and therefore will not count toward the 25 page limit.

10. With respect to the 19 wastewater systems in the state, the RFP does not specifically mention the communities served by the treatment facilities owned and operated by the Narragansett Bay Commission (i.e. Cumberland, Lincoln, Pawtucket, etc.). NBC owns the interceptor sewers and some of the larger pumping stations along the interceptor system but does not have any involvement in the collection systems in these communities. Will the consultant be responsible for coordinating with these communities to review their wastewater infrastructure?

Response: Wastewater collection infrastructure within satellite communities will be part of the over study of the NBC and other applicable systems (such as those which enter into the West Warwick, South Kingstown, and Woonsocket Regional Treatment Systems). The extent to which this can be done within the existing budget will be agreed upon jointly by DEM and the selected consultant.

11. Please confirm that the evaluation criteria for the cost proposals will be based on the product of the quotient of the lowest responsive cost proposal divided by the bidder's cost proposal, times 20 and not 15 as stated in the last bullet under Selection Criteria on Page 10 of the RFP.

Response: The evaluation criterion will be applied using 20 points for cost. The reference to 15 points was in error.

12. In Task 2, do you expect the maps to be produced in hard copy format?

Response: Some printed versions of maps will be necessary for coordinating with DEM and the local communities. Some version of the maps will also be necessary for final outreach materials. The DEM and consultant will determine the extent of paper versions of maps needed and possible as the project is underway.

13. Based on the description of Task 7, minimum/low environmental impacts are anticipated for the capital improvements, could you please share an example of the scope involved in developing such EAs, or point to online or other available EAs of similar scope that were sufficient to support a determination of a categorical exclusion or FONSI?

Response: Most RFPs for wastewater facilities plans, including environmental assessments, incorporate the RIDEM Facilities Planning Checklist as the scope of work. The sections of the FP Checklist relevant to the development of an Environmental Assessment were identified in this RFP. An example of a RIDEM approved wastewater facilities plan, including an environmental assessment, can be found at: <http://www.warwicksewerauthority.com/index.php/treatment-facility/facility-plan-amendment>

14. Does RIDEM expect that optional Task 7 would be included within the overall \$159,000 project budget?

Response: No. Task 7 will require additional funding to be allocated to the resulting contract award from this solicitation.

15. How many facilities would Task 7 apply to?

Response: The RFP states that for bidding purposes, the respondents should assume 95 capital projects identified and prioritized through earlier Tasks would be the subject of the environmental assessment. This averages 5 projects per wastewater system. The actual number may vary and will be clarified and specified in the contract resulting from this solicitation at the appropriate time.

16. Do subcontractors need to provide a generated bidder certification cover and a signed W-9, or just the prime contractor?

Response: Prime contractor only.

17. Can you please explain the preclusion clause on page 2, paragraph 3. It appears to ban any firm from bidding on any future work that is developed from this particular bid. If this is the case then we would probably pass on bidding on this job.

Response: See #1 above.

18. Is a fee required for the optional Task 7? If it is required it would be difficult to develop a scope and fee without further information.

Response: See question #4 above. Respondents should assume 95 projects would be part of the assessment and that such projects are distributed around the state within the service districts of the wastewater systems.

19. Would it be possible to have the due date extended by 1 week due to the holidays and pending response to questions, especially question 1 above.

Response: We will consider.

20. Question regarding the modeling required. Task 1 indicates that no NEW modeling would be required, and that was emphasized at the pre-bid meeting on April 17, but Task 3 does state that "this task may involve additional...new model runs." (p.6 RFP.) Please clarify whether this project only requires analysis/interpretation using existing models and not any new modeling.

Response: In stating that new model runs "may" occur, the DEM is not precluding or requiring new modeling. Rather, DEM looks forward to a variety of proposed methodologies from bidders that will offer creative ways to meet the state's needs as enumerated in the RFP. The DEM recognizes that the budget of this project does not encourage new modeling, especially in light of existing data. However the DEM would entertain proposals that include new modeling if the bidder demonstrates that such new model runs are necessary.

21. Regarding Task 7 (RIDEM Optional Task), is a fee estimate required for this task at this time? The level of effort for preparing the Environmental Assessment is dependent in large part on the findings of Task 4, as well as the potential need to collect additional data to support the Environmental Assessment.

Response: Yes, a fee estimate is required. As instructed in the RFP, for bidding purposes, respondents should assume a total of 95 capital projects are identified, averaging 5 per wastewater system. Respondents should provide an estimate of the effort needed to complete the environmental assessment for this universe of projects. As noted in the pre-bid conference, RIDEM's expectation is one report that will document in separate sections the environmental assessment for each system or community. The actual scope of the task may be different and will be addressed specifically through the contract resulting from this solicitation.

22. On Page 2, Section 1 paragraph 3 states “...respondent selected for award of a contract pursuant to this solicitation, and its affiliated or subsidiary companies (whether partially or wholly owned) shall be ineligible to bid upon any future consulting or construction solicitations which may arise from or relate to the services described in this solicitation.”

This language could be interpreted to mean that virtually any design or construction project associated with any of the facilities to be evaluated that incorporates a resiliency or adaptation component identified through the study would be off-limits to the awarded consultant. This creates a huge disincentive to respond to the solicitation for those firms who are most qualified to do so – those with a working knowledge of the facilities based on previous experience and expectation of continued future engagement. Can you confirm your intent behind this constraint? Is there a time limit associated with this exclusion?

Response: See #1 above.

23. Page 9, Proposal Contents Bullet 3 - Are the resumes of the key staff included in the 25 page count?

Response: No. Resumes can be attached in an appendix.

24. On Page 10, Selection Criteria Bullet 6 states “The resulting quotient is then multiplied by 15 to calculate the number of points awarded.” Should this quotient be multiplied by 20 instead of 15?

Response: Yes, the quotient will be multiplied by 20. Referencing 15 was in error.

25. Would a time extension of the submission deadline be considered?

Response: See question 19